

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/986,742

Applicant(s)

KOYAMA, JUN

Examiner

George C. Eckert II

Art Unit

2815

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) George C. Eckert II.

(3) Mr. Hiroshi Sunagawa.

(2) Jeff Costellia.

(4) Mr. Ryosuke Murata, Ms. Etsuko Fujimoto.

Date of Interview: 14 April 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All.


Identification of prior art discussed: Applicant's prior art, Asai et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**GEORGE ECKERT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives suggested claim language as to forming the TFTs from the same layer thus achieving better uniformity. Examiner indicated that Asai also taught desire for TFT uniformity such that the suggested language would not overcome the rejection. Representatives also pointed to the language of claim 25 as to the cross arrangement, as shown in fig. 11A, arguing it is not taught by the prior art or Asai. Examiner agreed it was not immediately apparent that either reference taught the arrangement and it would be considered further when a response is filed. Finally, representatives inquired about restriction of potential additional claims drawn to the analog transistors having dimensions twice that of the digital transistors. Examiner indicated that on first blush, such claims would likely not be restricted as a separate species as they did not appear mutually exclusive.